Applicant: Ajaipal Singh Virdy

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-218003

Serial No.: 10/705,822

Filed: November 13, 2003

Page : 7 of 9

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action of August 30, 2006, Applicants ask that all pending claims presently under consideration be allowed in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks. Claims 39-57 are pending, with claims 41, 49, and 57 being independent. Claims 1-38 are now cancelled and claims 41-57 are now added. Of the pending claims, claims 41-57 are presently under consideration, and claims 39 and 40 were previously withdrawn by the Examiner. No new matter has been introduced.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 29 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The cancellation of claim 29 renders this rejection moot. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 21-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Wesinger (U.S. Patent No. 5,778,367). The cancellation of claims 21-38 renders this rejection moot. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

New Claims 41-57

Applicants respectfully submit that newly added claims 41-57 are allowable because Wesinger fails to describe the subject matter of the new independent claims, as discussed in detail below.

Independent claim 41 recites a method for performing a search of network accessible content. The method includes traversing a network of web documents to identify business names and geographic data associated with the web documents. The method includes identifying a business name and geographic data associated with a particular web page, determining web page identifying data for the particular web page, and extracting the identified business name and geographic data associated with the particular web page. Based on the extracted business name and geographic data, the method includes accessing a business directory to determine a business

Applicant: Ajaipal Singh Virdy

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-218003

Serial No.: 10/705,822

Filed: November 13, 2003

Page : 8 of 9

category code that is associated with the extracted business name and geographic data, and storing the web page identifying data and the business category code in association with one another and within an entry in an electronic data store. The method includes receiving, from a user, a query that is related to a business category, identifying, within the electronic data store, one or more entries that include a business category code that is associated with the business category of the query, and returning, to the user, a result that includes web page identifying data included in the identified one or more entries.

Wesinger describes an automated on-line information service and directory in which content is entirely user-created and user-controlled. See Wesinger at abstract and col. 2, lines 58-61. Wesinger enables a user to create and electronically publish an entry, which functions as a mini homepage for the user, contains information about the user, and is associated with a user-selected category. See Wesinger at col. 2, line 61 to col. 3, line 37, col. 5, line 57 to col. 6, line 19, and Figs. 2L, 2M, 2N, and 2O. Wesinger also enables a user to search a database (e.g., the database that includes the user-created entries) using one of several searching models – namely, searching by category (i.e., navigating through a category hierarchy), searching by example (i.e., entering terms to be searched with respect to one or more fields associated with entries stored in the database), and searching by keyword (i.e., specifying a term against which the database should be searched). See Wesinger at col. 5, lines 30-56, col. 8, lines 10-46, and Figs. 2H, 2I, 2J, and 2K.

As such, Wesinger describes storing <u>user-created entries</u> that include information about the users in a database. Wesinger does not, however, describe or suggest storing business names and geographic <u>data associated with web documents</u> within a database, based on traversing a network of web documents to identify such information prior to storage thereof. Thus, Wesinger does not describe or suggest traversing a network of web documents to identify business names and geographic data associated with the web documents, as one step of storing, within an electronic data store, entries that each include web page identifying data and a business category code associated with a particular web page.

Moreover, because Wesinger does not describe or suggest storing, within an electronic data store, entries that each include, *inter alia*, a business category code, Wesinger does not describe or suggest identifying, within the electronic data store, one or more entries that include a business category code that is associated with the business category of a query provided by a user.

Applicant: Ajaipal Singh Virdy

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-218003

Serial No.: 10/705,822

Filed: November 13, 2003

Page : 9 of 9

Therefore, Wesinger necessarily does not describe or suggest returning a result to the user that includes web page identifying data included in such an identified one or more entries.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of independent claim 41, along with claims 42-48 that depend therefrom.

Independent claim 49 recites a computer program for performing a search of network accessible content in a manner corresponding to that of independent claim 41, and independent claim 57 recites a system that does the same. Accordingly, for the reasons noted above with respect to independent claim 41, Applicants request allowance of independent claims 49 and 57, along with claims 50-56 that depend therefrom.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

No fee is believed to be due. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/30/06

Stephanie Deckter
Reg. No. 58,652

Fish & Richardson P.C. 1425 K Street, N.W. 11th Floor

Washington, DC 20005-3500 Telephone: (202) 783-5070 Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40381861.doc